



Texas Department of Insurance

Division of Workers' Compensation

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

512-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • www.tdi.texas.gov

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address

KIRT REPP DC
PO BOX 9973
THE WOODLANDS TX 77387

Respondent Name

COMMERCE & INDUSTRY INSURANCE

Carrier's Austin Representative

Box Number 19

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-11-1885-01

MFDR Date Received

FEBRUARY 10, 2011

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "I would also like to point out that it is, in fact, a violation of the Texas administrative Code to discriminate against a health care provider based on scope of practice."

Requestor's Supplemental Position Summary: "First I would like to point out yet again that none of this documentation has anything to do with the NCS or the new patient office visit that I provided as part of the eletrodiagnostic evaluation dated 07-13-2010 that is in dispute. I have provided ample rationale as to why I should be paid including ODG 'Recommended' status of 'NCS' directly related to the compensable work-related injury for this specific patient...Second I would like to point out that the Judges' documents regarding needle EMG are void due to the fact that the TBCE has appealed the ruling to higher courts within the allowed legal time-frame...Third I would like to point out that it is, in fact, a violation of the Texas Administrative Code to discriminate against a health care provider based on scope of practice."

Requestor's Response to Email Regarding Payment Verification: The requestor verified that payment was issued for CPT code 99203 and stated "Claim was only partially paid. The carrier is still liable for the remaining codes." (Based upon this verification, CPT code 99203 will not be considered further in this decision)

Amount in Dispute: \$1,335.00

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "The Carrier is standing by their denial based on Judge Stephen Yelenosky's 11/24/2009 Summary Judgment Letter...which are all attached."

Response Submitted By: Chartis

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Dates of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
July 13, 2010	CPT Code 95861	\$200.00	\$0.00
	CPT Code 95934-50	\$125.00	\$76.04
	CPT Code 95903 (X4)	\$125.00/each	\$383.14
	CPT Code 95904 (X6)	\$85.00/each	\$432.32

TOTAL		\$1,335.00	\$891.50
-------	--	------------	----------

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

Background

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307, effective May 25, 2008, 33 *Texas Register* 3954, sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203, effective March 1, 2008, 33 *Texas Register* 364, sets the reimbursement guidelines for the disputed service.
3. 22 Texas Administrative Code §75, effective December 24, 2009, 34 *Texas Register* 9208, sets out the scope of practice for chiropractors.
4. District Court of Travis County, 250th Judicial District No. D-1-N-GN-06-003451, Honorable Stephen Yelenosky, Judge Presiding, Order on cross-motions for partial summary judgment dated November 24, 2009.
5. Texas Court of Appeals, Third District at Austin, NO. 03-10-00673-CV, Opinion dated April 5, 2012.
6. Texas Court of Appeals, Third District at Austin, NO. 03-10-00673-CV, Mandate dated August 8, 2013.
7. The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:

Explanation of benefits

- 185-The rendering provider is not eligible to perform the service billed.
- W1-Workers compensation state fee schedule adjustment.
- X394-Our position remains the same if you disagree with our decision please contact the TWCC Medical Dispute Resolution
- Z656-Any request for reconsideration of this workers' compensation payment should be accompanied by a copy of this explanation of review.

Litigation Background for Needle EMG and MUA

Portions of the Texas Board of Chiropractic Examiners rules of practice were challenged by the Texas Medical Association and the Texas Medical Board in 2009. At issue was whether 22 Texas Administrative Code §75.17(a)(3), (c)(2)(D), (c)(3)(A), and (e)(2)(O) were within the scope of chiropractic practice in Texas. Specifically, the parties sought judgment on whether rules allowing Chiropractors to perform needle electromyography (EMG) and manipulation under anesthesia (MUA) were valid. On November 24, 2009, the 345th District Court issued a judgment in which presiding judge Honorable Stephen Yelenosky concluded that needle EMG and MUA exceeded the statutory scope of chiropractic practice in Texas. The Texas Board of Chiropractic Examiners appealed the district court's judgment to the Texas Court of Appeals, Third District. The Texas Court of Appeals in *Tex. Bd. Of Chiropractic Examiners v. Tex. Med. Ass'n.*, 375 S.W.3d 464 (Tex. App. – Austin, 2012, pet. den.) issued an opinion affirming the district court's judgment, and concluding that needle EMG and MUA services are not within the chiropractic scope-of-practice. The Chiropractic Board exhausted its appeals and on August 8, 2013, the mandate affirming the district court's judgment was issued. The mandate states "...we affirm the remainder of the district court's judgment that subparts 75.17(a)(3), (c)(2)(D), (c)(3)(A), and (e)(2)(O) of the Texas Board of Chiropractic Examiners' scope-of-practice rule are void." In accordance with the Texas Court of Appeals opinion, the final mandate, and the scope of chiropractic practice requirement in 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203(a)(6), needle EMG and MUA services may not be reimbursed.

Issues

1. Is the rendering provider eligible to perform needle electromyography?
2. Is the rendering provider eligible to perform nerve conduction tests?
3. Is the requestor entitled to reimbursement for CPT codes 95934, 95903, and 95904?

Findings

1. CPT code 95861 is defined as "Needle electromyography; 2 extremities with or without related paraspinal areas." According to the medical documentation found, this service was performed by Kirt Repp, D.C. (Doctor of Chiropractic). The Texas Court of Appeals in *Tex. Bd. Of Chiropractic Examiners v. Tex. Med. Ass'n.*, 375 S.W.3d 464 (Tex. App. – Austin, 2012, pet. den.) issued an opinion affirming the district court's judgment, and concluding that needle EMG and MUA services are not within the chiropractic scope-of-practice of chiropractors. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203(a)(6) states "Notwithstanding Medicare payment

policies, chiropractors may be reimbursed for services provided within the scope of their practice act.” The division finds that disputed service code 95861 is not within the scope of chiropractic practice because it is an electro-diagnostic test that involves the insertion of a needle into the patient. Therefore, no reimbursement can be recommended for CPT code 95861 pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203(a)(6).

2. Disputed services 95903, 95904, and 95934 fall in the category of nerve conduction tests under applicable AMA current procedural terminology (CPT). These tests involve placing a stimulating electrode is directly over the nerve to be tested. These are surface tests that do not involve needles. According to the medical documentation found, these services were performed by Kirt Repp, D.C. (Doctor of Chiropractic). As stated in the Texas Court of Appeals, Third District at Austin, NO. 03-10-00673-CV, Opinion dated April 5, 2012

In the second provision, paragraph(c)(3)(A), TBCE imposed certification and supervision requirements on any licenses who administered “electro-neuro diagnostic testing” that varied according to whether the testing was “surface (non-needle)” or involved the use of needles. The import or effect of paragraphs (c)(2)(D) and (c)(3)(A), as the parties agree, was that chiropractors with specified training and certification could utilize needle EMG in evaluating or examining patients. In their live petitions and summary-judgment motions, the Physician Parties challenged the validity of the two rule provisions **specifically addressing needle EMG** [emphasis added]- 75.17(c)(2)(D) and (c)(3)(A) – plus the general standard regarding use of needles-75.17(a)(3).”

That is, surface tests were not in question during this suit. Pursuant to §75.17(c)(3)(A) effective December 24, 2009, *34 Texas Register 9208*, services 95903, 95904, and 95934 are within the scope of chiropractic practice because they are surface tests. Reimbursement is recommended for these services.

3. Because these studies, CPT codes 95934, 95903, and 95904, are within the scope of chiropractic practice reimbursement is recommended in accordance with 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203(c).

Per 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203(c)(1)(2), “To determine the MAR for professional services, system participants shall apply the Medicare payment policies with minimal modifications.

(1) For service categories of Evaluation & Management, General Medicine, Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Radiology, Pathology, Anesthesia, and Surgery when performed in an office setting, the established conversion factor to be applied is \$52.83. For Surgery when performed in a facility setting, the established conversion factor to be applied is \$66.32.

(2) The conversion factors listed in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be the conversion factors for calendar year 2008. Subsequent year's conversion factors shall be determined by applying the annual percentage adjustment of the Medicare Economic Index (MEI) to the previous year's conversion factors, and shall be effective January 1st of the new calendar year. The following hypothetical example illustrates this annual adjustment activity if the Division had been using this MEI annual percentage adjustment: The 2006 Division conversion factor of \$50.83 (with the exception of surgery) would have been multiplied by the 2007 MEI annual percentage increase of 2.1 percent, resulting in the \$51.90 (with the exception of surgery) Division conversion factor in 2007.”

To determine the MAR the following formula is used: (DWC Conversion Factor/Medicare Conversion Factor) X Participating Amount = Maximum Allowable Reimbursement (MAR).

The 2010 DWC conversion factor for this service is 54.32.

The Medicare Conversion Factor is 36.8729

Review of Box 32 on the CMS-1500 the services were rendered in zip code 77011, which is located in Houston, Texas. Therefore, the Medicare participating amount will be based on the reimbursement for Houston, Texas.

Using the above formula, the Division finds the following:

Code	Calculation for Locality 0440218 Houston	Maximum Allowable
95903	(54.32/36.8729) x \$65.02 for 4 Units	\$383.14
95904	(54.32/36.8729) x \$48.91 for 6 Units	\$432.32
95934	(54.32/36.8729) x \$51.62 for 1 Unit	\$76.04
		\$891.50

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, the Division finds that the requestor has established that reimbursement is due for the specified services. As a result, the amount ordered is \$891.50.

ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code Sections 413.031 and 413.019 (if applicable), the Division has determined that the requestor is entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute. The Division hereby ORDERS the respondent to remit to the requestor the amount of \$891.50 plus applicable accrued interest per 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.130, due within 30 days of receipt of this Order.

Authorized Signature

_____	_____	9/13/2013
Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date

YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20** (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. **Please include a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** together with other required information specified in Division rule at 28 Tex. Admin. Code §148.3(c).

Under Texas Labor Code § 413.0311, your appeal will be handled by a Division hearing under Title 28 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 142 rules if the total amount sought does not exceed \$2,000. If the total amount sought exceeds \$2,000, a hearing will be conducted by the State Office of Administrative Hearings under Texas Labor Code §413.031.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.